# **Illinois Commerce Commission**

Verizon Merger, Docket 98-0866, Condition 2
OSS Measurement, Reporting, and Incentive Plan Collaborative
Draft Meeting Minutes From 12/5/2000
To Be Reviewed 1/11/2001

The fifth collaborative meeting was held on December 5, 2000, in Hearing Room C in the ICC's headquarters in Springfield, Illinois. Following are minutes and action items from that meeting.

Mr. McClerren, ICC Staff, presided over the meeting

### I. Introductions

- A. Staff, Verizon, CLECs, Other Parties
- B. Sign up sheet, with contact name, address, phone & e-mail address (included on ICC's web site)

# II. Review Draft Meeting Minutes

The meeting minutes were reviewed and, with minor modification, approved.

# III General Discussion

The meeting commenced with discussion about how the collaborative will communicate its responsiveness to Condition 2 of Docket 98-0866. The following timeline was developed:

Shortly after Dec. 5, Sam McClerren will distribute timeline.

January 11, 2001, Next collaborative meeting

January 22, 2001, Verizon document to Jon Feipel, Sam McClerren and CLECs indicating Condition 2 has been completed

February 7, 2001, Verizon provide draft report to CLECs and Sam McClerren

February 14, 2001, CLECs/Sam McClerren will provide comments to Verizon about draft report

February 20, 2001, Verizon will provide final report to Jon Feipel, Sam McClerren and CLECs

It was noted that, to the extent Verizon's report did not satisfactorily address CLECs or Staff's comments, other parties would have the option of providing comments to Verizon's report. It was also noted that while Condition 2 might be concluding, there

would continue to be an ongoing collaborative process to address the performance measure/remedy program.

Then the collaborative addressed a performance measurement change process. The CLECs wanted to find out how changes would be proposed/communicated/approved, noting that a "change management" type process would be useful to document. Verizon representatives were uncomfortable with the term "change management," fearing that it might lead to an overly burdensome administrative process. Discussion revealed that the parties did not appear to be far apart in concept, and Ms. Karen Coleman of WorldCom committed to distributing a proposal for all parties to consider and discuss at the Jan. 11 meeting.

There was also discussion about how CLECs will avail themselves of the performance measure remedy plan. Initially, a relaxed procedure was discussed, but it became clear that it may be necessary to have a more formal process in place. Mr. Jason Hendricks of GVNW noted that the new performance measures may not provide benefit to some smaller CLECs who have service quality measures in their current interconnection, and wanted to know if the smaller CLEC has to take the new performance measures/remedies. Ms. Faye Raynor of Verizon noted that they did not want to be held in a "double jeopardy" situation where they are responsible to two different standards. Ms. Raynor promised to distribute interconnection agreement language to discuss at the Jan. 11 meeting.

Mr. Rod Cox of McLeodUSA indicated he would be willing to accept Verizon's proposed remedy plan on a trial basis if Verizon would agree to the parity with a floor proposal.

### IV. Review Verizon Proposals

A. Average Reject Notice Interval (Measure 3) and Average FOC/LSC Notice Interval (Measure 2) - Ms. Raynor started the discussion by noting that Verizon was willing to change its metric from "average" to "percent." Mr. Cox still wanted to pursue the "2, 5, 24 Hrs." offer. Ms. Raynor indicated that her systems would not perform at that rate, and asked if it would change his mind if he learned that this was not a "soft FOC." If Verizon could show that their FOC is consistently accurate, he would be very interested - i.e., How accurate is your facility inventory?

Ms. Raynor was able to provide data later in the meeting showing "missed due date" information, which would support facility inventory accuracy, and her data was very good, typically between 90% and 100%. Unfortunately, she was unable to offer this for centranet because it is considered a complex service. Centranet is the service that McLeodUSA is wanting to use. Ms. Raynor thought they would be able to offer flow through on centranet in late 2<sup>nd</sup> Qtr of 2001 - approximately June 2001.

Mr. Hendicks proposed making the >10 lines Resale POTS UNE criterion applicable to < 50 lines, 95% within 24 Hours, and > 50 lines, 95% within 72 Hours. Ms. Raynor indicated she would research the request further.

B. Time to Provide a Collocation Arrangement (Measure 40) - Mr. Hendricks indicated that he would like to see submeasures by type (caged, cageless, shared, adjacent, virtual). Ms. Raynor indicated that on a reporting basis, she was willing to accept the proposal. For remedies, the problem of low numbers made it impossible.

There was discussion about whether 90% or 95% was the correct metric, and Ms. Raynor indicated she would consider 95% further. There was also discussion about the definition of "on-time." While it should not be a problem, it was noted that the ICC tariff was not expected until May 17, 2001. Use the FCC definition in the meantime?

C. Time to Respond to a Collocation Request (Measure 41) - The CLECs continued to question the forecasting requirement, and there was a proposal of 3 collos per year without forecast. Both parties will consider further.

## V. Discuss Remedy Plans

Illinois current cap is \$4 million the first year, \$6 million the second year, and \$8 million the third year, for a total at risk of \$18 million. If the FCC proposal was accepted, the Illinois cap would increase to \$2 million per year, or a total at risk of \$126 million.

### VI. Discuss Remaining Schedule

- A. There was discussion of interim calls to address the number of lines (10, 20, 50), systems facility check on each order, and flow through definition documentation. There is also the possibility of a McLeodUSA call to address specific questions to Verizon.
- B. January 11, 2001, was chosen as next meeting date.